DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 721 SO 031 878

AUTHOR	Black, Mary S.
TITLE	Old and Older: Curriculum Standards for History and Archeology.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Archaeology; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *History; *National Standards; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*National History Standards

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the standards and principles recently proposed for teaching both history and archeology. By comparing the goals each discipline has set for good teaching, areas of difference and commonality can be discerned and questions concerning historical thinking and what may be called "archeological" thinking can then be formulated, thus leading to greater understanding not only of subject disciplines, but also of the cognitive functions students must practice to solve problems about the relationship of past and present. Curriculum standards for history and principles for curriculum reform for archeology recently have been promulgated to give greater focus to teaching in these disciplines; both sets of guidelines recommend training in basic research skills (analysis, evaluation, presentation of data), and neither set implies any discrete topics that must be taught. The curriculum standards for history in K-12 as proposed by the National Center for History in the Schools (1996) are focused on important skills for finding meaning in historical materials. These standards are presented as "historical thinking"; that is, the ability to put past events into context and engage in inquiry with the evidence. Guiding principles for the archeology curriculum at the undergraduate level recently have been proposed by the Society for American Archeology. However, no guidelines have been provided for teaching about archeology in K-12 schools. (Contains 2 tables [the guidelines] and 13 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 721

Old and older: Curriculum standards for history and archeology

Mary S. Black
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
The University of Texas at Austin
msblack@mail.utexas.edu

April 2000

SO 031 878

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary S. Black

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Manuscript prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Old and older: Curriculum standards for history and archeology

At the beginning of each new semester, I sometimes ask my students to define various social studies disciplines in their own words. "History," one student wrote, "is learning about old stuff." "And archeology," continued the same student, "is about stuff that is even older." Perhaps in some people's minds, this is the basic distinction between two academic fields that study the human past.

This distinction fails to hold in reality, of course, since neither historians nor archeologists place any sort of chronological limits on their endeavors. Both historians and archeologists study yesterday's newspaper and garbage dump with as much enthusiasm as a newly-discovered ancient city. Both fields ask inherently the same questions about the human past: who lived here? What did they do? Where did they go? What difference did they make?

This paper is an examination of standards and principles recently proposed for teaching both history and archeology. By comparing the goals each discipline has set for good teaching, areas of difference and commonality can be discerned. Questions concerning historical thinking and what may be called "archeological" thinking can then be formulated, thus leading to greater understanding not only of subject disciplines, but also of the cognitive functions students must practice in order to solve problems about the relationship of past and present.

As alluded to above, history and archeology are similar in important ways. Both disciplines study past human experience in order to understand the development of culture and ideas, patterns of movement, the genesis and repercussions of invention, and most of all, the universal dyad of continuity and change itself. Chronology is important to both fields, albeit the sequence of time may be constructed differently in each discipline. Both fields use documentary and artifactual evidence; even though history has sometimes been defined as dependent on written records and archeology claims primary reliance on material artifacts or objects. Every history museum attests to the value of objects in historical study. In turn, archeologists conduct thorough reviews of all written records connected to a certain place (if such records exist), as well as studying the bits and sherds of human activity. Both disciplines integrate knowledge and skills from various areas of the humanities, geography, and other fields. Systematic inquiry of such evidence is essential to scholars in both fields to collect and analyze their often overlapping data.

One of the most important ways history and archeology are different, however lies in the types of second-tier questions each field can answer. This is primarily due to the varieties of data available to scholars in the two fields, and the perspectives from which they analyze such data. History tends to have documentary evidence available for study, whereas archeology tends to have more fragmentary and often subtle forms of evidence that do not speak as clearly as written documents. Therefore, history can address questions at a greater level of detail about human actions than can most archeology. For example, historians

can give great insight into the thinking of the Founders of the United States when they wrote the Constitution. By the same token, however, historians can tell us little of the lives of the first people to inhabit North America. Archeologists cannot trace the intellectual lineage of these first people, but they can tell us much about the general lives and travels of these ancient ones.

Archeology extends the chronology of human life far beyond the scope of written documents. Whereas historians have approximately 500 years of written records for North America, archeologists have pushed back the first peopling of the continent almost 30,000 years (Gibbons, 1997; Wisner, 1997). Evidence such as the remains of an ancient campfire is studied through the methods of natural science to yield answers to general questions of human time span and agency. However questions of function and belief often remain unanswerable through archeological means, even as chronology becomes more exact.

Recently in the United States, scholars have proposed guidelines for curriculum standards in both history and archeology. The teaching of history in schools is a well-established practice, going well beyond the turn of the 20th century. Archeology is rarely taught in pre-collegiate settings, however, due partly to the relative newness of the field and also to political choices made long ago (Kehoe, 1994). Considering the common questioning of the human past, perhaps a useful interweaving of knowledge and skills from archeology into existing history teaching could be made to address inquiry into the human legacy.

Curriculum standards and principles

Curriculum standards for history (National Council for History in the Schools, 1996) and principles for curriculum reform for archeology (Bender & Smith, 2000) have recently been promulgated to give greater focus to teaching in these disciplines. Both sets of guidelines recommend training in basic research skills, such as analysis, evaluation, and presentation of data. Neither set implies any discrete topics that must be taught; rather they emphasize skills for making sense of any historical or archeological topic that may be encountered.

Curriculum standards for history in K-12 schools as proposed by the National Center for History in the Schools (1996) are focused on important skills for finding meaning in historical materials. These standards are presented as necessary for "historical thinking;" that is, the ability to put past events into context and engage in inquiry with the evidence (Rogers, 1987; VanSledright, 1997). The five broad skills needed to interpret historical evidence (Table 1) include chronological thinking, historical comprehension, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research, and historical issues-analysis and decision-making (National Center for History in the Schools, 1996.)

Guiding principles for archeology curriculum at the undergraduate level have recently been proposed by the Society for American Archeology (Bender & Smith, 2000). As yet, no guidelines for teaching about archeology in K-12 schools exist. A reasonable conclusion may be that if there were such guidelines, however, they would logically flow from the principles established for

undergraduate education in the field. These principles contain skills and understandings necessary to develop an archeological perspective towards cultural heritage. The seven strands of curricular thought recommended include stewardship, knowledge of diverse interests, social relevance, ethics and values, written and oral communication, basic archeological research skills (including excavation and analysis), and real world problem-solving (Table 2).

Both historical and archeological curriculum guidelines emphasize learning skills of research and logical thinking. This is a radical break from the memorization of famous names and dates in history or the telling of adventure tales in archeology once considered adequate teaching (Brophy, 1990; Krauss, 2000; Lipe, 2000; Romanowski, 1996). One apparent difference in the two sets of guidelines, however, is that archeology carefully wraps traditional excavation in layers of ethical concern. The ethical considerations of disturbing the human past are lessons hard learned by archeologists over the past 100-plus years. The current prominence of ethics and values in archeology corresponds in some ways with the recognition of multiple perspectives in history and the urge for environmental conservation in natural science. Disciplines, like people, develop greater depth of understanding as they mature.

What can these curricular guidelines tell us about thinking within each discipline? Do they indicate a fruitful coalition? Or an undeniable divergence? Clearly the history standards indicate a desire for students to question, analyze and evaluate historical information. The ultimate goal of such behaviors is to create informed citizens who can participate in democratic society (National

Council for History in the Schools, 1996, p. 41). An underlying assumption seems to be that as society and knowledge become more complex, asking questions and knowing how to find answers become more important than merely retaining a store of "facts."

The curriculum principles for archeology, on the other hand, demonstrate a need for students to evaluate each step of archeological inquiry before implementing such physical skills as excavation. In fact, basic archeological skills comprise only one portion of the guidelines, with ethical concerns (stewardship, diverse interests, social relevance, and ethics and values) weighing in before skills are even mentioned. Thinking ethically about archeological matters represents deep critical thinking in the field. Fagan (2000) suggests that the prime mission of archeology education is to create an informed citizenry, presumably in order to achieve the field's conservation and research goals (McGimsey & Davis, 2000). Such informed citizens will be able to evaluate the ethical conditions of inquiry into the past as well as utilize basic skills to protect resources and understand new information.

What is "historical" or "archeological" thinking? VanSledright (1997) has examined the development of the concept of historical thinking, and concludes that as yet no concrete, agree-upon definition exists. The notion of archeological thinking has yet to be explored fully for its own sake. One may say safely, however, that thinking in both fields concerns inquiring critically about evidence of the human past. Questions of ethics are examined in history through the analysis of credibility, authority and authenticity of the evidence, as well as

evaluation for bias, distortion, or propaganda. Ethical understandings about history also arise from a conscious effort to avoid interpreting the past through the deceptive lens of the present. These same elements are present in archeology, along with the notion of stewardship of cultural heritage resources. Questions about the social relevance of the past to the present and the future for different constituencies are also paramount in archeological thought.

Both fields exemplify complex cognition about the human past. Further analysis and discussion of these ideas may yield greater understanding of the cognitive tasks students are asked to perform under these curriculum guidelines. Finally, determining the most beneficial sequencing of abstract thinking skills taught in social studies classrooms may be one outcome of this further research.

Chronological thinking	the student has a sense of past, present, future; understands temporal sequencing; can use and create timelines; and can explain change and continuity over time
Historical comprehension	the student can understand basic elements of narrative structure (based on reading skills); can understand the past through the perspectives of the people of the time; can use maps effectively; can use visual and mathematical data from graphs and charts; and can use visual data from photographs, paintings, cartoons, etc.
Historical analysis and interpretation	the student can compare and contrast different experiences; can analyze differences; can distinguish fact from fiction; can consider multiple perspectives and causes; can challenge arguments of inevitability; can compare and evaluate various explanations of the past and hypothesize about the influence of the past
Historical research	the student can formulate questions based on evidence; can obtain historical data from a variety of sources; can analyze data for context, credibility, authority, and authenticity; can judge credibility of evidence, such as bias, distortion, propaganda by omission, suppression, or invention; and can construct narrative interpretations in writing and orally
Historical issues-analysis and decision-making	the student can identify problems and dilemmas of the past; can analyze points of view, values, and interests of those in the dilemma; can identify causes of the problem or dilemma; can propose alternative ways of solving the problem; and can formulate a position

Table 1. National Standards for History (National Council for History in the Schools, 1996).

Stewardship	the student has an appreciation of the non-renewable archeological record and cultural heritage resources
Diverse interests	the student understands that various groups have different kinds of interest in the archeological record: descendents of indigenous peoples, government agencies, and others. These groups often have divergent views on preservation and use of archeological resources
Social relevance	the student understands how the archeological record informs current and future problems
Ethics and values	the student understands the fundamental ethical position of archeology, i.e. conservation of cultural resources, public accountability, prevention of commercialization, public education and outreach, stewardship of intellectual property, public reporting, recording and preservation, and adequate training
Written and oral communication	the student exhibits clear writing (implying clear thinking), clear speaking, skill in public speaking, and computer literacy
Basic archeological skills	the student can excavate, analyze, observe carefully, make logical inferences, use map skills, organize and evaluate data, and apply knowledge of laws and regulations
Real world problem solving	the student understands professional accountability, archeopolitics, citizenship, business, legal and regulatory frameworks used in archeological decision making

Table 2. Principles for Curriculum Reform in Archeology (Bender & Smith, 2000).

References

Bender, Susan J. & Smith, George S. (Eds.) (2000). *Teaching archeology in the twenty-first century.* (pp. 9-16). Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archeology.

Brophy, Jere. (1990). Teaching social studies for understanding and higher-order applications. *The Elementary School Journal, 90,* 351-417.

Fagan, Brian M. (2000). Strategies for change in teaching and learning. In Susan J. Bender & George S. Smith (Eds.). *Teaching archeology in the twenty-first century.* (pp. 125-132). Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archeology.

Gibbons, A. (1997). Monte Verde: Blessed but not confirmed. *Science 175*: 1256-1257.

Kehoe, Alice B. (1994). "In fourteen hundred and ninety-two, Columbus sailed...": The primacy of national myth in U.S. schools. In Peter G. Stone & Robert MacKenzie (Eds.). *The excluded past: Archeology in education.* London: Routledge.

Krass, Dorothy Schotthauer. (2000). What is the archeology curriculum? In Susan J. Bender & George S. Smith (Eds.). *Teaching archeology in the twenty-first century.* (pp. 9-16). Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archeology.

Lipe, William D. (2000). Archeological education and renewing American archeology. In Susan J. Bender & George S. Smith (Eds.). *Teaching archeology in the twenty-first century.* (pp. 17-20). Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archeology.

McGimsey, Charles R. III & Davis, Hester A. (2000). The old order changeth: Or, now that archeology is in the deep end of the pool, let's not tread water. In Susan J. Bender & George S. Smith (Eds.). *Teaching archeology in the twenty-first century.* (pp. 5-8). Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archeology.

National Center for History in the Schools (1996). *National standards for history.* Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools.

Rogers, P. (1987). The past as a frame of reference. In C. Portal (Ed.) *The history of curriculum for teachers* (pp. 3-21). London: Falmer.

Romanowski, M. (1996). Issues and influences that shape the teaching of U.S. history. In Jere Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching, Vol. 6* (pp 291-312). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

VanSledright, Bruce A. (in press). On the importance of historical positionality to thinking about teaching history. *International Journal of Social Education.*

Wisner, G.B. 91997). On the trail of the first Americans. *American Archeology 1* (2), 13-17.